

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. Rejection of claims 1-10, 24-29, 31-38, 40-50, 58, 61-66, 68, 69, and 71-81 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0027659 (*Miyasaka*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the rejection fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. The remaining claims depend from claim 1, and are therefore patentable as containing all of the recited elements of claim 1, as well as for their respective recited features.

By way of review, the embodiment of pending claim 1 requires a system comprising at least one banknote processing machine, which is connected to a service center by means of a network. The system is configured so that data necessary for operation of the at least one banknote processing machine and/or data produced during operation of the at least one banknote processing machine are exchanged between the banknote processing machine and the service center via the network. Log files or statistics about *increasing deviations or irregularities* occurring during operation of the at least one bank note processing machine are transmitted to the service center over the network, and the service center evaluates the log files or statistics and causes repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the at least one bank note processing machine fails.

In this manner, an active response approach to repair machines or replace wearing parts on an ongoing, continuous basis as the specific need arises (as detected by *increasing deviations or irregularities*) is provided.

In contrast to pending claim 1, the *Makino* publication discloses an ATM network where customer specific display screens and services are provided to individual

customers based on stored attribute information for those customers (abstract; at least paragraphs [0009], [0010], [0016], [0061], and [0064]).

The *Makino* publication is completely silent as to log files or statistics about *increasing deviations or irregularities* occurring during operation of the ATMs being transmitted to a service center over a network, and the service center evaluating the log files or statistics and causing repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the ATMs fail, all as required by pending claim 1.

On page 3, the Office action acknowledges that the *Makino* publication fails to disclose log files being evaluated to effect machine repairs. It is respectfully submitted that the *Makino* publication also fails to disclose log files or statistics about *increasing deviations or irregularities* occurring during operation of the ATMs being transmitted to a service center over a network, and the service center evaluating the log files or statistics and causing repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the ATMs fail, all as required by pending claim 1.

The Office action next turns to the *Miyasaka* publication, which discloses an anomaly diagnosis apparatus and method of machine installation using a network for diagnosing the presence or absence of an anomaly in a sliding member used in a machine installation (title; abstract; paragraph [0001]).

In particular, the *Miyasaka* publication discloses an anomaly diagnosis apparatus of a machine installation for diagnosing the *presence or absence* of an anomaly in a sliding member (at least paragraphs [0033], [0038], [0040], [0044], [0045], [0047], [0058], [0061], [0063], [0066], [0067], [0070], [0071], [0073], [0074], [0082], [0086], [0091], [0093], [0094], [0096], [0097], [0106], [0111], [0115], [0175], [0190], [0193], [0200], [0205], [0211], [0232], [0255], [0345], [0375], [0398]).

In particular, sound or vibration of the machine or component is measured to determine the *presence or absence* of an anomaly caused by damage in the machine or part (paragraphs [0107], [0210], [0232], [0237], [0242], [0345]). The diagnosis

apparatus can be used to estimate the magnitude of damage, in order to determine the part replacement time and to reduce excessive parts replacement and maintenance (paragraphs [0107], [0109], [0346], [0350]).

There is no disclosure or suggestion in the *Miyasaka* publication, however, of log files or statistics about *increasing deviations or irregularities* occurring during operation of ATMs being transmitted to a service center over a network, and the service center evaluating the log files or statistics and causing repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the ATMs fail, all as required by pending claim 1.

Even if the system of the *Miyasaka* publication were added to the ATM network of the *Makino* patent, the proposed combination still fails to disclose or suggest at least log files or statistics about *increasing deviations or irregularities* occurring during operation of the ATMs, as is required by pending claim 1

Accordingly, since the proposed combination of the *Makino* and *Miyasaka* publications fails to disclose or suggest every feature of pending claim 1, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established with respect to claim 1, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As mentioned above, applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable and therefore, claims 2-10, 24-29, 31-38, 40-50, 58, 61-66, 68, 69, and 71-81, which depend from claim 1, are also considered to be patentable as containing all of the elements of claim 1, as well as for their respective recited features.

2. Rejection of claims 11-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0027659 (*Miyasaka*) and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2002/0046061 (*Wright et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Wright* publication fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of

the *Makino* and *Miyasaka* publications as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claims 11-20 and 22 depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0027659 (*Miyasaka*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,508,398 (*Estes*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Estes* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* and *Miyasaka* publications, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claim 21 depends.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0027659 (*Miyasaka*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 7,092,907 (*Kanevsky et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Kanevsky* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* and *Miyasaka* publications, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claim 23 depends.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of claims 30, 53-57, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0027659 (*Miyasaka*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,430,470 (*Nakajima et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Nakajima* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* and *Miyasaka* publications, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claims 30, 53-57, and 67 depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0027659 (*Miyasaka*) and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2004/0164141 (*Egami et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Egami* publication fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* and *Miyasaka* publications, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claim 39 depends.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

7. Rejection of claims 51 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0027659 (*Miyasaka*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 7,395,241 (*Cook et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Cook* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* and *Miyasaka* publications, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claims 51 and 52 depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

8. Rejection of claims 59 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0027659 (*Miyasaka*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,363,164 (*Jones et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Jones* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* and *Miyasaka* publications, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claims 59 and 60 depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

9. Rejection of claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0027659 (*Miyasaka*) and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2008/0243915 (*Shah et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Wallis* publication fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* and *Miyasaka* publications, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claim 70 depends.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

10. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-0200.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicants' attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: April 13, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick M. Buechner/

PATRICK M. BUECHNER
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,504